DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 229 814 CS 504 201

AUTHOR Austin, Bruce A.
TITLE Researching the Film Audience: Purposes, Procedures, and Problems.
PUB DATE Mar 83
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Conference on Culture and Communications (Philadelphia, PA, March 1983).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Audiences; Behavior Patterns; Communication Research; Decision Making; *Films; Institutional Research; *Research Methodology; *Research Needs; Research Opportunities; *Research Utilization
IDENTIFIERS *Audience Research

ABSTRACT

Film audience research complements institutional research, verifying scholarship on the meanings films have to viewers and providing broad-based explanations of film images. Most important, such research focuses on the decision and motivation processes people use before they set foot in the movie theater, thereby helping to construct a context within which other kinds of film research may be initiated, interpreted, and integrated. Audience research can also be used for policy issues at the formulation, implementation, and evaluation stages. Since all research methodologies have their limitations, film audience research requires a variety of approaches, both qualitative and quantitative. Nevertheless, for any film audience study, there is a need for replication and careful analysis of data. Finally, film research cannot overlook the importance of studying the entire population, particularly the nonmoviegoer and the infrequent moviegoer. (JL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED229814

RESEARCHING THE FILM AUDIENCE: PURPOSES, PROCEDURES, AND PROBLEMS

BRUCE A. AUSTIN

Rochester Institute of Technology
College of Liberal Arts
Rochester, New York 14623

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Bruce A. Austin

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A Paper Presented

to

The Fifth International Conference

on Culture and Communications

March, 1983

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

CS504201

RESEARCHING THE FILM AUDIENCE: PURPOSES, PROCEDURES, AND PROBLEMS

In a recent paper Becker suggested that "The influences on film [scholarship]. . . are more from humanities scholars than social scientists. More than anything else," he continued, "the history that has shaped our film research is the history of literary theory and research and, to a lesser extent, art theory."[1] Guback directly challenged us to ponder the important question of whether we were looking at the right things in film.[2] Becker's assessment is readily verifiable by even the most cursory review of the film literature. And, in tandem with Guback's query, the issue of what other methods and approaches might be meaningfully employed and brought to bear on the subject of film is raised. In an earlier paper I maintained that although the film medium has attracted "considerable research attention from historians, aestheticians, and students of law and technology", little in the way of systematic, valid, reliable, and theoretically-grounded research has focused on the recipients, or consumers, of theatrically exhibited motion pictures.[3] It is my purpose in this paper to address such issues as: what is film audience research, why do such research, and how might film audience research be conducted?

Research on moviegoers largely directs attention away from such questions as what's on the screen, how can what's on the screen best be explained, and how does what's on the screen get to the screen (i.e., economic, institutional, systemic, and

industrial processes)? Film audience research does not - or at least ought not - negate the value of such questions or their answers. Instead, audience research helps to provide closure insofar as it forms an important and integral part of the movie phenomenon gestalt.[4] In fact, audience research can be viewed as the complement to institutional research and a means to verify scholarship on the meanings film images have to viewers. Also, appropriately conducted, audience research offers the advantage of avoiding possibly idiosyncratic explanations of screen images by individuals with specialized knowledge in favor of a more popular or broad-based and audience-centered response. And, although it might be argued that such idiosyncratic explanations are the "right" ones or the "best" ones (or select any other value-laden modifier), film is a mass medium and hence understanding the popular response - however erroneous or misguided - by definition, serves an important purpose. As for the institutional approach, if we accept Guback's definition of it as providing an analysis of "the economic and industrial structures and arrangements involved in cinema, and the means by which entertainment and information are processed and allocated as commodities," we can see how audience research dovetails with institutional research. Audience studies focus on the recipients and the consumption process of such entertainment and information. The consumption process - in the broadest sense of the term - can be seen as an important and necessary correlate to the organizational aspects of movies; afterall, motion pictures are not made for no one. Thus, for instance, audience research might offer answers to the question: what is the viewer response to institutional strategies, policies,

and methodologies? Further, it can be seen that the institutional and audience approaches are not mutually exclusive but instead form opposite - but not opposing - poles of the same continuum. Thus, while at present perhaps these two approaches are studied separately, future endeavor in film scholarship should be directed at a synthesis or integration of the institutional and recipient/consumptional literature.

Research on moviegoers directs our attention toward such questions as how do audiences respond to what's on the screen, and why do they respond in the ways they do? More importantly though, research on moviegoers also asks us to do more than make ex post facto measurements of reaction; it necessitates and indeed demands a proactive posture. I view this as a - if not the - key purpose of such research. Film audience research raises questions concerning the decision and motivation processes humans use before they set foot in the movie theater, before they decide which movie they will go to, and, further, before they even elect movies as an activity to engage in. Thus a primary question that audience research must ask is what is it that moves individuals to alter their present nonmovie-oriented behavior in such a way that movies become their behavior? What specific kinds of conditions and circumstances bring, or encourage, people to initially become motivated to go to the movies and, subsequently, to go about their specific movie attendance decision process? Answers to these kinds of questions make possible the formulation of more meaningful "effects" research and policy research, to cite but two examples. The motivation and decision processes, once (but not necessarily once and for all) identified and explained, help to construct a

(but not necessarily the only) context within which other kinds of film audience and film research may be initiated, interpreted, and integrated.

The alliteration just presented suggests, I hope, a response to the what and why questions raised at the end of the first paragraph of this paper. The alliteration, of course, is designed to function as a summary tool rather than exhaustive explication. The alliteration further suggests a steering clear of "the notion of data collection for its own sake"[5] and places film audience research squarely, and appropriately, I think, in what Blumler has called the "conciliatory strand" of mass communications research.[6] Blumler traces this "strand" back to post-war writings by Merton and offers as a contemporary example Lang's assertion that "There is no inherent incompatibility between the 'positivism' of administrative communication research and the critical approach associated with the Frankfurt school."[7]

More specifically, film audience research offers relevant information to scholars concerning human motivational and cognitive processes as well as affective and behavioral responses (i.e., why people go to the movies and how and why they react to movies in the ways they do). Research on the uses and gratifications of motion pictures would tap motivational and cognitive aspects and would provide a context for affective and behavioral responses.[8]

For example, research on a particular phenomenon such as loneliness and that phenomenon's relationship to moviegoing (including reasons for attendance) may offer insights to such related consequences as susceptibility to persuasion. Over two

decades ago Olsen conducted preliminary research on the relationship between social isolation and movie attendance.[9] Although his results were later found to be in error,[10] and in his report he did not pursue the relationship beyond frequency of attendance, the idea is compelling. Yet follow-up studies which investigate such "three-stage" (or more) interactive concepts are not to be found in the literature. Further, for those who object to the possibility of theoretical research, such as the uses and gratifications approach, being applied to such meretricious endeavors as market research and discovering ways of selling people something, there is a corollary. The findings of numerous studies[11] support the concept of a discriminating contemporary film audience: for most people, moviegoing is a directionally specific activity; people go to a movie, not the movies. Therefore, while the uses and gratifications approach to mass communications may be applicable as a strategy for examining, understanding, and explaining movie attendance as a general activity, it is a less appropriate approach when applied to a specific movie attendance decision. For most people, most of the time, theories of motivation for going to the movies would be too parsimonious to be meaningful; market researchers would be more interested, instead, in the decision factors, or salient variables, which motivate going to a movie which presumes that the initial motivation for electing movies as an activity to engage in has already occurred.

Audience research can also be meaningfully employed for policy issues at the formulation, implementation, and evaluation stages. Policy decisions and policy making that are directed at mass communications audiences need to be developed and evaluated in terms

of their behavioral implications. Such research provides understanding and insight into the full range of effects, both intentional and unintentional, that such policies have.

For example, a recent report analyzed and evaluated the Motion Picture Association of America's (MPAA) film classification policy.[12] Using the results from more than 20 social science studies, the report investigated the degree to which this self-regulatory policy has met its purpose, achieved its goal, and whether or not the policy's method for implementation was appropriate or counterproductive. By drawing together the diverse studies and their results and focusing them on these three key aspects of the policy, the report found that the MPAA's purpose for establishing its policy had not been fulfilled: film ratings carry little informational value and thus parents cannot be expected to use them as a guide for their children's moviegoing (the self-acknowledged purpose of the policy). Moreover, the literature suggested that parents did not hold the ratings in high regard. The goal of the MPAA policy is to protect certain age groups from exposure to certain kinds of film content. The research literature showed that if an under 17-year-old wants to see an R-rated movie unaccompanied by an adult, s/he has at least a fifty percent chance of being admitted and it was concluded that the policy is meaningful and effective only to the extent that it is enforced. The third aspect that was investigated concerned the appropriateness of the method for implementing the policy: age-group attendance restrictions by classifying films, according to their content, into age-specific attendance categories. On this point the literature revealed that the method for implementation was appropriate insofar

as film classification did not produce a boomerang effect (i.e., age attendance restrictions fostering a desire for restricted films among those individuals the policy wishes to protect from exposure). The report went on to suggest methods for remedying the problems identified. Further, international aspects of relevance were suggested since many other nations also have film classification policies quite similar in structure to the U.S. movie industry's (e.g., Australia, Canada, Germany, Great Britain, New Zealand).

From these brief examples it can be seen that audience research does not have to be administrative in the pejorative sense which that term is often used. That it can or might be used for such purposes is self-evident and it would be foolish to argue otherwise. Quite obviously most any research on persuasion would very likely be welcomed by advertising agencies, among others. The point is, though, that audience research can take a variety of postures and be used for myriad reasons.[13] No more than any other form of research, film audience research is neither neutral nor exists in a vacuum; and to argue philosophical or ideological neutrality would be as misguided as accepting as true what Myrdal called "naive empiricism."[14]

How might film audience research be conducted? Regardless, it seems, of the specific research question being addressed, a variety of approaches and tools need to be brought to bear. The temptation to become married to either a particular tool or design must be resisted since no one methodology is without its limitations. As Webb et al. have stated: "the issue is not choosing among individual methods. Rather it is the necessity for a

multiple operationalism, a collection of methods combined to avoid sharing the same weaknesses."[15] Thus, the posture of multiple operationalism suggests the utility - indeed, the necessity - of giving up, one would hope once and for all, the red herring that qualitative and quantitative research are inherently at odds and irreconcilable with one another.[16] It may, for instance, be reasonably accurate to characterize qualitative research as providing us with a lot about a little while quantitative research offers a little about a lot. Together these two approaches to examining film audiences offer the potential for understanding the richness and variety of the movie experience. Each, of course, has its limitations and hence we are brought full circle back to the multiple operationalism posture. An analogy illustrating this point concerns criticism of the effects model of mass communications research offered by Howitt. He suggests four key drawbacks to this model. However, he states, and this is equally applicable to any methodology for film research,

> we can criticize donkeys for not being race horses too much. Since no one has yet discovered a way of investigating the totality of the human experience in one fell swoop, at worst the effects model [read quantitative, qualitative, critical, etc. methodology] can only be blamed for diverting attention to questions that some researchers find relatively uninteresting.[17]

Traditional quantitative procedures as the questionnaire, for example, offer an approximate, consciously self-reported, measurement to questions raised by the survey designer about the respondents' past and projected behaviors and their affective

and cognitive dispositions concerning various phenomena. The laboratory experiment offers clear evidence for causality but, with either its tacit or explicit endorsement of the ceteris paribus assumption is immediately open to criticism for removing that which is under investigation from the complexity of "real life." The limitations of surveys, experiments, and such are, by now, well-known and usually given at least passing acknowledgement in most introductory research methods texts.[18] In the remainder of this paper I would like to focus on issues of particular concern - but not necessarily unique - to the film audience researcher adopting a quantitative approach.

Just the concept of using quantification has, of course, been vexing since its inception. For example, in 1947 Doscher[19] discussed film audience research from the perspective of a (marketing research) service to the (client) motion picture industry. With quantification and the use of various summary statistics such as measures of central tendency, she noted that "the audience is reduced, in its multiple relations with the total film, to a single statistic."[20] Few would question the accuracy and seriousness of this drawback. Yet the best and most reasonable response to this, it seems to me, is not to summarily dismiss the entire approach as fraught with irrevocable flaws. Instead this should encourage researchers to compare the findings of their quantitative work with the findings of researchers using alternative methods. Where do similarities in results exist? Where are there differences? What accounts for the differences; i.e., are the methodologies the source or is there some other explanation which is more plausible? What all this suggests is

a bit less methodological partisanship among researchers and more reflection on what the accumulated data seem to be "saying." This, I suppose, again places me in the conciliatory strand mentioned earlier. It also returns us to the alliteration concerning what film audience research is about: providing a context within which other forms of film research may be initiated, interpreted, and integrated. A second point noted by Doscher is that "the investigator may become absorbed in the refinement of his statistics, and so neglect to question its adequacy for a total description of his audience in the communication situation."[21] Here we are reminded of students who approach their research methods instructor and flatly state, "I'd like to do a Q-study." And the by now wised-up or jaded academic responding with such deft zingers as: "Well, that's nice. A Q-study on anything in particular?" Perhaps, though, this also serves to remind us that the research method or tool ought not determine the research question.

In an earlier report I argued that film audience researchers must get out of the classroom and laboratory and into the field since the phenomenon of interest needs to be studied in its natural environment.[22] In addition to reiterating this, let me conclude by adding three additional points. First, for any film audience investigation, regardless of methodology, there is a need for replication. We know that, in the absence of covering laws[23] governing events and human behavior, the chance or atypical occurrence is inevitable. Thus, the results of any one study may, in fact, be the chance occurrence. Gaffney has suggested this remedy:

> Instead of doing dissertations that make 'original" (and in most cases dubiously "original") contributions to the literature, doctoral candidates should be required to replicate significant and pivotal experiments. The results would be refined methodology and a complete understanding of the phenomenon in question.[24]

A corollary to this first point is that mistakes are made by researchers and hence reanalysis of original data can serve an important corrective and "quality control" function. For example, in 1977 Bannerman and Lewis[25] published the results of their study on college students' attitude toward movies. They reported that their sample held a slightly-to-moderately-favorable attitude toward motion pictures. A couple of years after their report was published I replicated it and performed a reanalysis of their data.[26] My sample of college students reported a somewhat unfavorable attitude toward movies. Moreover, my reanalysis of the Bannerman and Lewis data, using what I believe to be a more refined, precise, and accurate method, indicated that their sample held at best a neutral-to-slightly-unfavorable attitude toward films. As this example illustrates, the results of empirical - if not all - studies must be checked for accuracy and thoroughness of data analysis and interpretation. Of course, the task of replication and reanalysis "requires that interested researchers be able to obtain information about published studies from the original researchers."[27] Wimmer and Reid studied the willingness of communications researchers to provide such information. They found that of the 77 researchers in their sample who responded to

their request for information (a 66.9% response), 55 "indicated that the raw data and other information were readily available" and 22 "advised that the data requested were unavailable."[28]

The second point is related to the first and concerns the interpretation of data gathered by a researcher as well as subsequent reference to these data by other writers. The danger is that either or both uncritical acceptance and misinterpretation of data may lead to "findings" which, for whatever the reason, take on "a life of [their] own that seems to defy attempts to correct the record."[29] Rice's report of several researchers' work to debunk the "myth" of the Hawthorne Effect "contains a moral of caution for behavioral researchers and those who uncritically accept their pronouncements."[30] At the very least, this should cause us to become sensitive to the careful scrutiny which is demanded by social research.

The final point I would like to make will undoubtably warm the hearts of many - I hope it will also serve to motivate corrective action. The issue is that of external (especially population) validity and it is certainly not unique to film audience research; in fact, if anything, it may best typify quantitative social science research in general. Its relevance to qualitative research, further, is also clear. As Lowry has stated: "if one of the main purposes of social research is to develop general explanations of human behavior, then the question of population validity is always of some importance in a research study."[31] Despite claims that since the largest group of filmgoers fall within the high school-college age bracket, therefore "for film research, the college student may be more representative than students used in other

research,"[32] research cannot overlook the importance of understanding the entire population - in particular the non-moviegoer and the infrequent moviegoer. Simon has cautioned that "the most frequent compromise with randomness in the social sciences is the use of college students as the sampled universe when the researcher would like to study the universe of all people . . ."[33] To take but one example, the entire literature on attitudes toward movies is based solely on high school and college students.[34] Obviously this forces a rather severe limitation on what can be said about people's attitude toward film. Aside from their special status as students,[35] if we accept the high frequency of attendance argument then, by definition, we are left with even less to talk about. And, if, as most would suggest, the link between attitude and behavior exists (regardless of the causal direction of reflexivity of the link), it would seem intuitively reasonable to inquire into the attitude of the less frequent moviegoer as well.

In short, then, audience research uncovers and displays various aspects of the cinema experience from the recipients' perspective. It seeks to uncover the cognitive apparatus employed by moviegoers in such situations as the initial motivational impetus for moviegoing. It uses such cognitive information as a context for interpreting affective and behavioral responses to the film experience, including policy evaluation. Audience research offers a window to what goes on once a film enters the exhibition circuit and is offered to potential recipients for consumption. As was discussed here, quantitative analyses of film audiences are not without their limitations. But this does

not mean that this methodology should be neglected. Instead, these limitations serve as signposts which direct our attention to the need for implementation of alternative methods - just as the limitations of, for instance, nonquantitative methods point to areas which may be appropriate for inquiry using a quantitative approach.

[1]Samuel L. Becker, "The Historical Origins of Mass Communication Research in Our Field," paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Conference, Louisville, Kentucky, November 1982.

[2]Thomas H. Guback, "Are We Looking at the Right Things in Film?," paper presented at the Society for Cinema Studies Conference, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1978. Guback discusses the institutional approach to the medium.

[3]Bruce A. Austin, "The Motion Picture Audience: A Neglected Aspect of Film Research," paper presented at the Ohio University Film Conference, Athens, Ohio, April 1982. Available in ERIC ED 214 211 and, in a somewhat revised form, Bruce A. Austin, Research on the Film Audience: An International Bibliography with Annotations and an Essay (Metuchen, New Jersey: Scarecrow Press, forthcoming).

[4]It should be noted that while in this paragraph and subsequent ones I use the present tense to describe film audience research, this may be misleading. The tense implies that there is a great wealth of such research and that much is presently being done in the way of conducting such research. This is certainly not the case. To take but one example, a recent review of mass communications research notes that "films have been of [research] interest principally because of their sexual content" thereby suggesting that the medium is essentially incidental to its content. See Robert M. Liebert and Neala S. Schwartzberg, "Effects of Mass Media" in Mark R. Rosenzweig and Lyman W. Porter (Eds.), Annual Review of Psychology, vol. 28 (Palo Alto, California: Annual Reviews Inc., 1977), pp. 141-173.

[5]Sari Thomas, "Some Problems of the Paradigm in Communication Theory," Philosophy of Social Science 10 (1980): 427-444.

[6]Jay G. Blumler, "Mass Communication Research in Europe: Some Origins and Perspectives," paper presented at the International Communication Association Conference, Acapulco, Mexico, May 1980.

[7]Kurt Lang, "The Critical Functions of Empirical Communication Research: Observations on German-American Influence," Media Culture and Society 1 (January 1979): 83-96, quoted in Blumler, "Mass Communication Research in Europe." For discussion of the administrative and critical approaches to mass communications research see Jay G. Blumler, "Purposes of Mass Communication Research: A Transatlantic Perspective," Journalism Quarterly 55 (Summer 1978): 219-230.

[8]For an overview of uses and gratifications research see Jay G. Blumler and Elihu Katz, The Uses of Mass Communications (Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1974). For a critique of this approach to mass communications research see David L. Swanson, "The Uses and Misuses of Uses and Gratifications." Human Communication Research 3 (Spring 1977): 214-221.

[9]Marvin E. Olsen, "Motion Picture Attendance and Social Isolation," Sociological Quarterly 1 (April 1960): 107-116.

[10]Marvin E. Olsen, "Correction of 'Motion Picture Attendance and Social Isolation,'" Sociological Quarterly 6 (Spring 1965): 179.

[11]See, for instance, Bruce A. Austin, "Film Attendance: Why College Students Chose to See Their Most Recent Film," Journal of Popular Film and Television 9 (Spring 1981): 43-49 and Los Angeles Times, A Look at Southern California Movie-going (Los Angeles: Los Angeles Times, 1972) which found that 73% of its respondents (teenagers and adults) reported they had decided to see a particular picture before deciding to go to the movies,

rather than the other way around (i.e., deciding to go to the movies before deciding which film to see).

[12]Bruce A. Austin, "G-PG-R-X: The Purpose, Promise and Performance of the Movie Rating System," Journal of Arts Management and Law 12 (Summer 1982): 51-74.

[13]Adams discussed the distinction between film research taking the social science and market perspective: "The producer wants to know what audiences like so that he can make more money. The social scientist goes further and wants to know what the effect of mass communications is upon our culture." That Adams omitted mention of motivational aspects is perhaps understandable given the research emphasis in mass communications at the time when he wrote the above. See William B. Adams, "A Definition of Motion-Picture Research," Quarterly of Film, Radio and Television 7 (1952-1953): 415. See also Paul F. Lazarsfeld and Frank N. Stanton, Communications Research, 1948-1949 (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949), p. xiv and Franklin Fearing and Genevieve Rogge, "A Selected and Annotated Bibliography in Communication Research," Quarterly of Film, Radio and Television 6 (Spring 1952): 284.

[14]Gunnar Myrdal, Objectivity in Social Research (New York: Pantheon Books, 1969), p. 9. He states that naive empiricism is the "implicit belief in the existence of a body of scientific knowledge acquired independently of all valuation." Later (pp. 43-44) he goes on to note that "we are under the influence of tradition in our sciences, of the cultural and political setting of our environment, and of our own peculiar personal make-up."

[15]Eugene J. Webb, Donald T. Campbell, Richard D. Schwartz, and Lee Sechrest, Unobtrusive Measures (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966), pp. 1-2.

[16]For a discussion of misconceptions concerning and other aspects of qualitative research see Clifford G. Christians and James W. Carey, "The Logic and Aims of Qualitative Research" in Guido H. Stempel, III and Bruce H. Westley (Eds.), Research Methods in Mass Communication (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1981), pp. 342-362 (on misconceptions see pp. 345-347) and Robert S. Fortner and Clifford G. Christians, "Separating Wheat from Chaff in Qualitative Studies" in Stempel and Westley, pp. 363-374.

[17]Dennis Howitt, The Mass Media and Social Problems (New York: Pergamon Press, 1982), p. 9.

[18]See, for example, Arthur A. Lumsdaine, "Experimental vs. Survey Techniques for Determining the Effects of Motion Pictures," paper presented at the Conference on Public Opinion Research, Princeton, New Jersey, June 1951; an abstract of this paper appears in Public Opinion Quarterly 15 (Winter 1951-1952): 771-772.

[19]Luelyne Doscher, "The Significance of Audience Measurement in Motion Pictures," Journal of Social Issues 3 (Summer 1947): 51-57.

[20]Doscher, "The Significance of Audience Measurement in Motion Pictures," p. 53.

[21]Doscher, "The Significance of Audience Measurement in Motion Pictures," p. 54.

[22]Austin, "The Motion Picture Audience." For a discussion of ethnomethodology see Harold Garfinkel, Studies in Ethnomethodology (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1967) and Hugh Mehan and Houston Wood, The Reality of Ethnomethodology

(New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1975). For qualitative research methods see Robert Bogdan and Steven J. Taylor, Introduction to Qualitative Research Methods (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1975).

[23]For a discussion of the covering law approach see Charles R. Berger, "The Covering Law Perspective as a Theoretical Basis for the Study of Human Communication," Communication Quarterly 25 (Winter 1977): 7-18. For a critique of this approach and others, see Jesse G. Delia, "Alternative Perspectives for the Study of Human Communication: Critique and Response," Communication Quarterly 25 (Winter 1977): 46-62.

[24]Michael D. Gaffney, "Needed: Dissertations that Replicate" (letter to the editor), Psychology Today 17 (January 1983): 70. For additional comments on the usefulness of replication as a means to ferret out scientific fraud and reasons why replication occurs infrequently see William J. Broad and Nicholas Wade, "Science's Faulty Fraud Detectors," Psychology Today 16 (November 1982): 51-57. See also: Clifford W. Kelly, Lawrence J. Chase, and Raymond K. Tucker, "Replication in Experimental Communication Research: An Analysis," Human Communication Research 5 (Summer 1979): 338-342 and Nathanial C. Smith, Jr., "Replication Studies: A Neglected Aspect of Psychological Research," American Psychologist 25 (1970): 970-975.

[25]Julia Bannerman and Jerry M. Lewis, "College Students' Attitude Toward Movies," Journal of Popular Film 6 (1977, no. 2): 126-139.

[26]Bruce A. Austin, "Attitudes Toward Movies: A Literature Review and Case Study," Media Information Australia, in press and Bruce A. Austin, "People's Attitude Toward Motion Pictures," in Sari Thomas (Ed.), Film/Culture: Explorations of Cinema in its Social Context (Metuchen, New Jersey: Scarecrow Press, 1982),

pp. 222-236. Reanalysis of the Bannerman and Lewis data was made possible by the authors' inclusion of their raw data in their report.

[27]Roger D. Wimmer and Leonard N. Reid, "Researchers' Response to Replication Requests," Journalism Quarterly 59 (Summer 1982): 317. For related research on scientists from other disciplines see: Leonard N. Reid, Herbert J. Rotfeld, and Roger D. Wimmer, "How Researchers Respond to Replication Requests," Journal of Consumer Research 9 (September 1982): 216-[illegible] and Leonard N. Reid, Lawrence C. Soley and Roger D. Wimmer, "Replication in Advertising Research: 1977, 1978, 1979," Journal of Advertising 10 (1981, no. 1): 3-13.

[28]Wimmer and Reid, "Researchers' Response to Replication Requests," p. 318.

[29]Berkeley Rice, "The Hawthorne Defect: Persistence of a Flawed Theory," Psychology Today 16 (February 1982): 72.

[30]Rice, "The Hawthorne Defect," pp. 70-74.

[31]Dennis T. Lowry, "Population Validity of Communication Research: Sampling the Samples," Journalism Quarterly 56 (Spring 1979): 62.

[32]William R. Elliott and William J. Schenk-Hamlin, "Film, Politics and the Press: The Influence of 'All the President's Men,'" Journalism Quarterly 56 (Autumn 1979): 553.

[33]Julian L. Simon, Basic Research Methods in Social Science, 2nd ed. (New York: Random House, 1978), p. 315.

[34]See Austin, "People's Attitude Toward Motion Pictures."

[35]See Carin Rubenstein, "Psychology's Fruit Flies," Psychology Today 16 (July 1982): 83-84.